





U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

6-1



File: [REDACTED] Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: 11-18-2004

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:




Petition: Immigrant Petition for Special Immigrant Religious Worker Pursuant to Section 203(b)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(4), as described at Section 101(a)(27)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(27)(C)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.


Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

Administrative Appeals Office
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Department of Homeland Security

11-18-2004

DISCUSSION: The employment-based immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner seeks to classify the beneficiary as a special immigrant religious worker pursuant to section 203(b)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(4). The director denied the petition on June 19, 2003. The instant appeal was filed on July 18, 2003.

8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) states, in pertinent part, “[a]n officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.”

The statement on the appeal form reads:

We have more evidence to justify our petition, for the beneficiary’s prior work experience, and the petitioning church’s guarantee that the beneficiary will not be dependent on outside employment or solicitation of funds for support, with more specifications.

The petitioner also claimed that a brief and/or evidence would be forthcoming within 30 days. To date, more than one year later, no further submissions have been received.

As the petitioner does not claim that any of the director’s findings are incorrect or based on an erroneous conclusion of law the petitioner has failed to overcome the specific findings of the director. In the absence of any allegation detailing specific errors of fact or law made by the director, we cannot find that the petitioner’s submission qualifies as a substantive appeal.

Inasmuch as the petitioner has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact as a basis for the appeal, the regulations mandate the summary dismissal of the appeal.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.